

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the telephone interview of October 14, 2003. If the Examiner has any suggestions that may make the claims allowable, the Applicants request that the Examiner call the Applicants' attorney.

Claims 4-6 and 15-19 have been cancelled. Claims 7 and 12 have been amended. Claims 1-3, 7-14, and 20-26 are pending.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 7-14, and 20-26 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Gregory '567 in view of Chaisson '513. The Examiner stated that Gergory '567 inherently teaches, or makes obvious all of the limitations of the claims except the specific teaching of the use of a universal shopping cart. The Examiner states that Wolfe et al. (but the applicant believes the Examiner meant Chiasson since the Examiner cites paragraph numbers, which are not in Wolfe and since Wolfe is not cited as a reference in this paragraph) teaches a similar data center system whereby a universal shopping cart is used. The Examiner further stated that it would be obvious to modify Gregory to use a universal shopping cart, in view of Chiasson, in order to greatly "facilitate e-commerce between a user and multiple merchant sites" (Chiasson paragraph [104]).

The Examiner failed to point out anything in Gregory or Chiasson that discloses or makes obvious a single payment process to purchase a plurality of items from a plurality of the plurality of vendors as recited in claim 1. The Examiner agrees that Gregory does not teach a universal shopping cart that allows a single payment process to purchase a plurality of items from a plurality of the plurality of vendors. Although Chiasson teaches an order list, Chiasson, teaches individual purchasing steps for each item in the order list paragraphs [0093]-[0099] of Chiasson. For at least this reason, claim 1 is not made obvious by Gregory in view of Chiasson

Claims 7 and 12 have been amended to recite check-out logic for providing a checkout page to at least one consumer that is able to provide costs for the items selected from the plurality of vendors where the costs include tax and shipping costs and a single checkout procedure that provides for the purchase of the items selected from the plurality of vendors. These added features

are not disclosed or made obvious by Gregory or Chiasson. For at least these reasons, claims 7 and 12, as amended, are not made obvious by Gregory in view of Chiasson.

Claims 2-3, 8-11, 13-14, and 20-26 each depend either directly or indirectly from independent claims, and are therefore respectfully submitted to be patentable over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the independent claims. Additionally, these dependent claims require additional elements that when taken in the context of the claimed invention, further patentably distinguish the art of record. For example, claim 11, further recites a gift registry logic. In addition, claim 20 recites that the single payment process is a single checkout process. Claim 22 further recites that the MV-CPU is able to charge consumers directly and notify the plurality of vendors of purchases. Claim 24 further recites that the MV-SD contains tax tables, discount schedules, and shipping costs from the plurality of vendors. For at least these reasons, claims 2-3, 8-11, 13-14, and 20-26 are not made obvious by Gregory in view of Chiasson.

The Examiner rejected claims 7 and 12 under 5 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Imamura et al '600 in view of Wolfe et al. Neither Imamura et al. nor Wolfe disclose or suggest the added feature of a checkout logic that provides costs for the items selected from the plurality of vendors, where the costs include tax and shipping costs and where a single checkout procedure provides for the purchase of items selected from the plurality of vendors. For at least these reasons, claims 7 and 12 are not made obvious by Imamura in view of Wolfe.

Applicants believe that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully request a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at telephone number (831) 655-2300.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



Michael Lee
Registration No. 31,846

P.O. Box 778
Berkeley, CA 94704-0778
(831) 655-2300